digenously from the price control list at least for the first 5 years.

(iv) To exclude those life-saving drugs and pharmaceutical products whose availability is for more important than the price. As the nature of demand is such that it is required less frequently but its non-availability is fatal. The notable examples of such categories are sera and vaccines.

(v) Exclude those pharmaceutical products of drugs where the domestic production structure is so competitive that there is little possibility that the consumers will be overcharged compared to the cost of production.

(e) As per the provisions of DPCO, 1987, the referred formulations are price decontrolled and the concerned manufacturer is free to revise the prices.

Statement

Name of the formulation	Unit (Kgs.)	1984-85		1985-86		1986-87	
		Quantity	CIF value (Rs.)	Quantity	CIF value (Rs.)	Quantity	CIF value (Rs.)
Fluocinolone Acetonide	—	36	2570208	39	2892839	23	1557496

Notices to Drug Companies

4589. DR. (SHRIMATI) NAJMA HEPTULLA : Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 3275 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 22nd August, 1988 and State :

(a) the names of the drug companies to which notices were sent from 1984 to 1987;

(b) the names of the drugs involved in each case ;

(c) what are the details of the follow-up action taken ;

(d) whether his Ministry finalised the amount due from any of the companies;

(e) if so, what are the details thereof ;

(f) whether it is a fact that his Department is deliberately not taking any action despite the powers available under the Essential Commodities Act;

(g) whether any investigation is being proposed to fix responsibility against those responsible for the non-recovery of public money which was overcharged from poor masses of the country; and

(h) if so, by when and if not, what are the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHRI J. VENGAL RAO): (a) and (b)

Information, to the extent available is given in the Statement I and II (*See* below).

(d) and (e) Information, to the extent available, is given in the Statement III (*See* below).

(c) and (f) The determination of amounts and recovery of the same is a continuous process.

(g) No, Sir.

(h) Does not arise.

Statement—I

RIFAMPICIN

1. Biochem Pharmaceuticals
2. Lyka Labs.
3. Astra IDPL Ltd
4. Micro Labs.
5. Themis Chemicals Ltd.
6. Alembic Chemicals Labs.
7. Bombay Drug House.
8. Pharmed Pvt. Ltd.
9. Dolphin Labs.
10. Albert David Ltd.
11. Pharmaceuticals & Chemicals Ind.
12. Cadila Labs (P) Ltd.
13. Sarabhai Chemicals.
14. Lupin Labs.
15. Ranbaxy Labs.
16. Wallace Pharmaceuticals.
17. Ethico Drugs & Chem. Mfg. Co.

DIPHYRIDAMOL

1. M/s. German Remedies

GENTAMYCIN

1. M/s. Fulford India Ltd. (Court Case)
2. M/s. Biochem Pharma Ltd.
3. M/s. Lyka Labs Ltd.

Statement – II

Name of the Bulk Drug

1. Rifampicin
2. Dexamethazone
3. clofazamine
4. Doxycycline
5. Metronidazole
6. Ampicillin
7. Gentamycin
8. Dipyridamol
9. Salbutamol
10. Flucimolone
11. Naproxen
12. Chloroquine
13. Aspirin
14. Dapsone

Statement—III

Details of tentative amounts assessed and recoverable under para 7(2) of DPCO, 1979

Sl. No.	Name of Company	Tentative amount assessed (Rs.)
1	2	3
	RIFAMPICIN	
1.	Biochem Pharmaceuticals	34,27,875.95
2.	Lyka Labs.	56,56,747.72
3.	Astra IDL Ltd.	24,10,758.96
4.	Micro Labs	2,23,725.95
5.	Themis Chemicals Ltd.	36,30,838.00

1	2	3
6.	Alembic Chemicals Labs	38,72,747.98
7.	Bombay Drug House	1,73,051.00
8.	Pharmed Pvt. Ltd.	68,00,776.80
9.	Dolphin Labs.	18,10,988.20
10.	Albert David Ltd.	3,91,419.00
11.	Pharmaceuticals & Chemicals Ind.	87,993,26.50
12.	Cadila Labs. Pvt. Ltd.	76,52,433.00
13.	Sarabhai Chemicals	4,13,986.48
14.	Lupin Labs.	2,15,89,000.00
15.	Ranbaxy Labs.	47,77,652.40
16.	Wallace Pharmaceuticals	2,82,071.00
17.	Ethico Drug & Chemical Mfg. Co.	1,40,97,889.00
	DIPHYRIDAMOL	
1.	M/s. German Remedies	59,95,039.00
	GENTAMYCIN	
1.	M/s. Fulford India Ltd. (Court Case)	194.62 Lakhs
2.	M/s. Biochem Pharma Ltd.	33.88 Lakhs
3.	M/s. Lyka Labs Ltd.	27.47 Lakhs

Recovery of DPEA arrears

4590. DR. (SHRIMATI) NAJMA HEPTULLA : Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 3282 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 22nd August, 1988 and State :

(a) whether it is a fact that his Ministry has failed to recover the amount overcharged from the consumers by drug companies under DPEA;

(b) whether it is also a fact that his Ministry has not been able to obain information from the companies o whom notices were sent under the rovision of DPCO, 1979 despite the act that full powers are available to spect and collect information;

(c) whether it is also a fact that his linistry has not been able to work ut the estimated amount due from e companies; and

(d) if so, what are the reasons therefor ?

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHRI J. VENGAL RAO) : (a) No, Sir.

(b) to (d) Many of the companies did not furnish the required details. The amount for which notices issued for recovery have been disputed and representations made. However, the determination of amounts and recovery of the same is a continuous process and appropriate action as per due process of law would be taken.

4591. [*Withdrawn*]

Overcharging of prices on drugs

4592. SHRI DHARANIDHAR BASUMATARI : Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 3308 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 22nd August, 1988 and state :